

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art (hereafter "Related Art"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

For example, claim 1 recites a radio network controller including a plurality of protocol layers, which comprises a plurality of blocks each formed of protocol layers obtained by segmenting said plurality of protocol layers, wherein said plurality of blocks comprises a first block and a second block, and wherein the first block and second block are connected by a User Datagram Protocol (UDP)/ Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) layer arranged therebetween.

Referring to Figure 6, a radio network controller (RNC) is connected to a base station (Node B) using a UDP/IPv6 layer therebetween. Likewise, the RNC is connected to a Core Network (CN node) using a UDP/IPv6 layer therebetween.

The Examiner appears to interpret the Related Art's RNC, base station, and router as the claimed blocks (See page 3 of the Office Action). However, the RNC, base station, and router are separate nodes and do not exist within the RNC node. That is, the Related Art does not teach or suggest an RNC which includes a UDP/IPv6 layer between a plurality of protocols forming blocks which exist within the RNC node. Instead, the Related Art teaches a UDP/IPv6 protocol which is arranged between nodes and connects the different nodes to the RNC. Thus, the Related Art does not teach or suggest a radio network controller which comprises a plurality of blocks each formed of protocol layers, wherein said plurality of blocks comprises a first block

and a second block, and wherein the first block and second block are connected by a User Datagram Protocol (UDP)/ Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) layer arranged between said plurality of blocks, as recited by claim 1.

Because the Related Art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, Applicants submit that the claim is patentable. Applicants further submit that claim 8 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 2, 5-6, and 9-11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Related Art in view of U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2003/0123485 to Yi et al (hereinafter “Yi”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Yi performs QoS control by feeding back traffic information on RLC to PDCP. However, Yi does not cure the deficiencies of the Related Art noted above with respect to claim 1. That is, Yi does not teach or suggest a radio network controller which comprises a plurality of blocks each formed of protocol layers, wherein said plurality of blocks comprises a first block and a second block, and wherein the first block and second block are connected by a User Datagram Protocol (UDP)/ Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) layer arranged between said plurality of blocks, as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Independent claim 5 recites features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1. Because Yi does not cure the deficiencies of the Related Art noted above with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 5 is patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1. Applicants further submit that claims 6, 9, and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 5.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Related Art, in view of Yi and further view of U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2003/0123392 to Ruutu (hereinafter "Ruutu"). Ruutu does not cure the deficiencies of Yi and the Related Art noted above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

Claims 4, 7, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Related Art in view of Yi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,302,497 to Vilander et al (hereinafter "Vilander") and U.S. Patent No. 4,682,150 Mathes (hereinafter "Mathes"). Vilander and Mathes do not cure the deficiencies of Yi and the Related Art noted above with respect to claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 4, 7, and 12-15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on one of claims 1 and 5.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Application No.: 10/552,450

Attorney Docket No.: Q90623

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean M. Conner/  
Sean M. Conner  
Registration No. 60,840

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 24, 2009